

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 13-15, 20-23, 25-29, and 31-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 20-21, 23, 2-27, and 31-36 have been amended; claims 3-4, 7, 9, 12, 16-19, 24, and 30 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; and no new claims are added. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended and/or cancelled various claims solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this Application. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute the subject matter of any claim pending prior to the foregoing Amendment, or any other subject matter supported by the Specification, in one or more continuation and/or divisional applications.

### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner has rejected claims 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. *Final Office Action* at page 2, ¶12. These claims recite "wherein at least a portion of the first haptic effect and the second haptic effect are output at a same time." Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the reason that the Specification at, for example, paragraph 0031 ("overlapping haptic effects") describes the recited features as claimed. As such, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-15, 17, 20-23, 25-29 and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,148,875 to Rosenberg *et al.* ("Rosenberg"). Applicants traverse this rejection because Rosenberg does not teach or suggest all the features of the claimed invention. Nonetheless, solely to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have cancelled claims 4, 9, and 17 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of these claims moot, and have amended the remaining pending claims to

clarify various features of the claimed invention. Rosenberg does not teach or suggest all the features of the claims as amended.

More particularly, Rosenberg does not teach or suggest at least the feature of “outputting a control signal to an actuator at a prescribed time after receiving the input signal” as recited in independent claim 5. Independent claims 14 and 26 recite similar features. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that “figure 8a reference 86” teaches or suggests this feature. *Final Office Action* at page 5, lines 2-5. However, reference 86 from Fig. 8a of Rosenberg describes “[o]ne or more actuators 86.” See, e.g., *Rosenberg* at col. 16, ll. 48-49. Rosenberg is silent with regard to “outputting a control signal to an actuator at a prescribed time after receiving the input signal” as claimed. For at least this reason, Rosenberg fails to teach or suggest all the features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection of at least claims 5, 14, and 26 is improper and must be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Rosenberg does not teach or suggest at least the feature of “outputting a control signal to an actuator that is coupled to a housing of the handheld communication device, the control signal configured to cause the actuator to output a first haptic effect to the housing” as recited in independent claim 1 as amended. Independent claims 5, 10, 14, 20, and 26 have been amended to recite similar features. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Fig. 8 of Rosenberg teaches or suggests outputting haptic effects to a handheld communication device in relation to claim 4 (features of which are now incorporated into claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 20, and 26 as amended). *Final Office Action* at page 4. However, Rosenberg at Fig. 8 describes outputting haptic effects to a touch screen of a portable computer device such as a PDA not to a housing of a handheld communication device as claimed. The Examiner has failed to articulate a rationale underpinning to support a legal conclusion of obviousness for at least the reason that outputting a haptic effect to a touch screen is not outputting a haptic effect to a housing of a handheld computing device as claimed. As such, the rejection of at least claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 20, and 26 as amended is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 21-23, 25, 27-29, and 31-36 depend from and add features to one of claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 20, and 26. These dependant claims are not

taught or suggested by Rosenberg for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 20, and 26. Accordingly, the rejection of these dependant claims is improper and must be withdrawn.

## **CONCLUSION**

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Final Office Action and, as such, the Application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **September 21, 2009**

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Hean L. Koo

Registration No. 61,214

**Customer No. 26158**

WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC  
P.O. Box 7037  
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037  
Main: 404-872-7000  
Direct Dial: 703-394-2274  
Fax: 404-888-7490